

putting their hands on the Bible had sworn to support the constitution of the United States, which says that no man's property shall be taken without compensation, and then at one blow had wiped out sixty millions of property belonging to the people of Maryland. It was a gross outrage upon those people, and if it were possible he would say pay them, but under the circumstances his mouth was closed. Could this Convention help them? He thought not. They were sent here by the people with the understanding that a prohibition against State compensation was to be inserted in the constitution. He could not disobey this injunction, and go home to Alleghany. Besides other people had lost their property during the war; how were they to be compensated. His stables had been burned, his house mobbed and his life endangered, and along the border similar cases had occurred. He had nothing to do but to submit, as it was the result of war.

Mr. Stoddert said this was right of justice; and the Legislature, by its prohibition, had committed a greater outrage upon them than the radicals of 1864. He would say perish a thousand constitutions sooner than sacrifice the eternal principles of right and justice. He cared for no constitution which did not secure to him the privileges of a freeman, and if this section was left in as reported he should advise his people to vote against it. He did not come here to make a constitution to keep his party in power, but to obtain his rights, of which he had been deprived.

Mr. Carmichael (Mr. Dent in the chair) asked permission to assign the reasons why he should vote against the amendment, and in doing this he might say why this feature in the bill calling the Convention was placed there. The subject was fully discussed at the time, and no reason had been adduced why it should not be placed there, and no reason had since been adduced why it should not be there. The gentleman on his left and the gentleman from Charles, (Mr. Stoddert,) had rambled off into attacks on this feature, and threatened the constitution with defeat if it is inserted. But they have not brought forward one single reason why the State should compensate them for the loss of their property. Was their section the only